

FACILITIES REVIEW COMMITTEE TECHNICAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Major Issues

1. The proposed grading of the subject site for Lots 14 through 17 will result in creating an area on Lot 17 that would not easily be accessible to the property owners with the proposed fence and landscaping.
2. Additional mitigation for the retaining wall system at Lots 14 through 17 is needed in order to reduce the impact of the wall design on the surrounding area.

Section 40.03 Facilities Review Committee:

The Facilities Review Committee has conducted a technical review of the application, in accordance with the criteria contained in Section 40.03 of the Development Code. The Committee's findings and recommended conditions of approval are provided to the decision-making authority. As they will appear in the Planning Commission Decision and Order, the Facilities Review Conditions may be re-numbered and placed in different order.

The decision-making authority will determine whether the application as presented meets the Facilities Review approval criteria for the subject application and may choose to adopt, not adopt, or modify the Committee's findings, below.

1. *All critical facilities and services related to the development have, or can be improved to have, adequate capacity to serve the proposal at the time of its completion.*
2. *Essential facilities and services are available or can be made available prior to occupancy of the development. In lieu of providing essential facilities and services, a specific plan strategy may be submitted that demonstrates how these facilities, services, or both will be provided within five years of occupancy.*

The applicant's previous approvals of the Blackstone Subdivision has found that all critical and essential facilities and services will be provided and have adequate capacity to serve this development at the time of its completion. The proposal is to modify grading on four lots (Lots 14 through 17) and to phase the development of the subdivision. The applicant proposes the development of the subdivision in two phases. Phase one includes the development of Lots 1 through 6, 21, 22, and 23 with improvements such as the extension of SW Cynthia Court to SW 155th Street, construction of a portion of SW Hammond Terrace, the SW 155th improvements, and other

associated improvements. Phase 2 includes all other improvements as approved in the original Subdivision application. The proposed grade modifications as the phasing of the site appears to not preclude the proposed development from providing critical and essential facilities and services. The City Development Services Engineer has reviewed the applicant's utility and grading plans and has provided a list of conditions in response to these plans to ensure adequate critical and essential facilities are provided and installed. Therefore, the Committee finds that these facilities will be adequate, subject to the conditions of approval requiring construction to meet City standards

Therefore, staff finds by meeting the conditions of approval the proposal meets the criterion.

3. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 20 (Land Uses) unless the applicable provisions are subject to an Adjustment, Planned Unit Development, or Variance which shall be already approved or considered concurrently with the subject proposal.*

The applicant states that the proposal is only for a modification to the grading plan and to propose phasing of the subdivision. The previous land use approvals (LD2003-0033) found that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Chapter 20 of the Development Code. The proposed grading and retaining wall modifications will not preclude the project from meeting the provisions of Chapter 20 as previously approved.

Therefore, staff find the criterion is met.

4. *The proposal is consistent with all applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations) and that all improvements, dedications, or both required by the applicable provisions of Chapter 60 (Special Regulations) are provided or can be provided in rough proportion to the identified impact(s) of the proposal.*

The proposal is a modification to the grading and to request phasing of the proposed subdivision. The previous approvals were based on findings that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Chapter 60. The proposed modifications are not expected to preclude the development from meeting Chapter 60 as identified in the original approval.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

5. *Adequate means are provided or can be provided to ensure continued periodic maintenance and necessary normal replacement of the following private common facilities and areas: drainage ditches, roads and other improved rights-of-way, structures, recreation facilities, landscaping, fill and excavation areas, screening and fencing, ground cover, garbage and recycling storage areas and other facilities, not subject to periodic maintenance by the City or other public agency;*

The request for grade changes to four residential lots will result in creating terraced retaining walls at the southeast corner of Lot 17. The applicant's landscape plan shows that the continuous landscaping conditioned by the Commission in the original approval will be located at the top of the retaining walls. With the continuous landscaping located above, this will likely create an isolated area adjacent to the public right-of-way. While the property owner is responsible for the maintenance of this area, the design of the proposed grades may result in lack of maintenance of this highly visible area as it will be isolated from the rest of the lot. Further, the applicant states in their neighborhood meeting that signage for the subdivision along with additional plantings may be placed in this area. To improve the likelihood that this area is maintained, staff recommend a condition that the southeast corner of Lot 17, south of the proposed arborvitae, be within an easement accessible by the property owners within the subdivision in order to maintain landscaping and signage in this area.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

6. *There are safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation patterns within the boundaries of the site.*
7. *The on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation system connects to the surrounding circulation system in a safe, efficient, and direct manner.*

The proposed grading will not affect the on-site vehicular and pedestrian circulation system or connection to the surrounding system. The applicant states the proposed phasing will facilitate safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the boundaries, and further states that Phase 1 is to include construction of SW Cynthia Court and a portion of SW Hammond Court. The Site Plans shows improvements to SW 155th Avenue as part of Phase 1. Staff concurs with the Site Plan in that improvements on SW 155th are necessary, as these improvements ensure that the on-site improvements connect in a safe manner to the existing street system. As the subject site is adjacent to SW 155th, the improvements to the right-of-way are necessary to ensure adequate vehicular and pedestrian connections to the

area. Staff recommend a condition to clearly state that improvements approved for SW 155th are to be constructed as part of the Phase 1 development.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval, criteria 6 and 7 are met.

8. *Structures and public facilities and services serving the site are designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards at a level which will provide adequate fire protection, including, but not limited to, fire flow, and protection from crime and accident, as well as protection from hazardous conditions due to inadequate, substandard or ill-designed development;*

The applicant states the proposal will not alter circulation or lot access. Further, walls associated with the proposed grading will be designed in accordance with adopted City codes and standards at a level which will provide protection from hazardous conditions. The developer will need to show compliance to the City's Building Code Standards prior to issuance of building permits. Conditions identified in Attachment C of the staff report are to ensure that the retaining walls are designed to meet City Standards.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

9. *Grading and contouring of the site is designed to accommodate the proposed use and to mitigate adverse effect(s) on neighboring properties, public right-of-way, surface drainage, water storage facilities, and the public storm drainage system.*

The applicant states the grading changes are proposed to accommodate the proposed use and the height and mass of the walls are mitigated by the provision of an arborvitae hedge planted 30-inches on center. While the arborvitae will provide screening above the subject site, the modification of the grading is likely to create an isolated area at the southwest corner of Lot 17 which is a highly visible location within the subdivision. While the applicant has stated in their neighborhood review meeting that additional plantings would be included in the area proposed for grade changes, the Landscape Plan does not show any plant material at the southern property line of Lot 17. Staff recommend that landscaping be provided by the applicant to provide both visual mitigation and minimize erosion in this area. A revised Landscape Plan shall be provided meeting the City's standard conditions of approval for landscaping. Further to ensure the modified grading will not result in adverse impacts to the surrounding property, the

Committee recommends that detailed grading, drainage, and erosion control plans be provided with the Site Development Permit.

The applicant's proposal requests to modify the retaining wall at the northeast corner of the subject site from what was originally approved. The neighborhood has raised a concern with the proposed retaining wall. In a letter dated October 11, 2004, Ms. Parkin state: "Neighbors opposed 1) its existence 2) the proposed design 3) the proposed quality of materials." The original application included the design and construction of a retaining wall. However, the design of the wall is to be modified to accommodate the grade changes. In the original approval the retaining wall was at a maximum height of five feet and was constructed on Lot 14 and a small portion of Lot 17. The current proposal terraces the retaining wall at a maximum height of approximately 13 feet (five feet for the bottom level and eight feet for the top level of the terraced retaining wall) on Lot 17 and is gradually reduced through Lots 14, 15 and 16 to a height of two feet. The increase in the mass of the retaining wall is to accommodate the grade changes and to improve the building pads.

While the height of the overall retaining walls will be higher than what was originally approved as well as the size, the applicant's proposal to terrace the retaining walls will break up the mass of the height needed to accomplish the proposed grading. The applicant provides an exhibit to show the design of the retaining wall showing examples of the block wall design. In reviewing the proposed wall exhibit, staff recommend that the wall design include a cap on the top of the retaining wall as shown in one of the wall examples to provide additional aesthetic improvement. Staff recommends a condition requiring a landscape plan for the area around the retaining wall to mitigate for the proposed grade changes. Considering the proposed wall design in conjunction with additional landscaping in the area staff find adequate mitigation is provided to address the increase in the height of the retaining wall and the proposed grade changes.

Therefore, staff find that by meeting the conditions of approval, the proposal meets the criterion.

10. *That access and facilities for physically handicapped people are incorporated into the site and building design, with particular attention to providing continuous, uninterrupted access routes.*

The applicant states that public access routes will not be affected by the proposed grading changes or the phasing of the development as each phase will provide a continuous public way through the site. The proposed changes

are not expected to effect accessibility of the site or buildings to the physically handicapped.

Therefore, staff find that the criterion is met.

11. *The proposal contains all applicable application submittal requirements as specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code.*

Staff in a letter dated August 27, 2004 determined that the application met the requirements specified in Section 50.25.1 of the Development Code and deemed the application complete.

FINDING: Therefore, staff find the proposal meets the criterion for approval.

RECOMMENDATION

The Facilities Review Committee finds that the proposal complies with all the technical criteria. The Committee recommends that the decision-making authority APPROVE the proposal and adopt the conditions of approval in Attachment C.